

**e.) Remarks.**

By this supplemental response, claims 20 and 22 have been amended and claim 23 has been canceled. Therefore claims 1-22 and 24-30 remain pending. Claims 1-15 have previously been allowed.

**Remarks Regarding the Amendments to Claims 20 and 22**

As per the conversation with Examiner Soderquist, claims 20 and 22 have both been amended to include the elements of now canceled claim 23. As such, claims 20, 22 and their dependants are in condition for allowance and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**Remarks Regarding Claims 16-19**

Claims 16-19 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) based on Schafer (Berichte der Bunsen-Gesellschaft, 1983), in view of van der Weide (SPIE, 1999 or NATO Science Series, II, 2001) and in further view of Stumpf (USP 4,998,422). The Examiner contends that “reducing pressure of the trap” does not necessitate closing the system off to create a vacuum because drawing off the fluid without sealing the system would still create lower pressure. However, the claim further recites, “... evacuating the remainder of the fluid that is not condensed.” This step refers to the fluid, which originally contained the chemical species of interest, that remains uncondensed after the chemical species of interest is condensed. In order to measure the submillimeter absorption of the chemical species of interest, remaining uncondensed fluid is evacuated from the sample cell. In direct contrast, Stumpf maintains a system that is open to the environment, and therefore is unable to evacuate the remainder of the fluid since new fluid is constantly being drawn into the system. Therefore, Applicant asserts that Stumpf alone or in combination with Schafer and/or van der Weide, does not teach or suggests all of the elements claimed in independent claim 16. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Additionally, neither Stumpf alone nor in combination with Schafer and/or van der Weide teaches or suggests the elements claimed in dependant claims 18 and 19. Specifically, neither Stumpf alone nor in combination with Schafer and/or van der Weide teaches or suggests “heating the trap to a second temperature that is higher than the first temperature”

(see claim 18) or the "first and second temperatures ... [are] determined by the boiling points of the chemical species" (see claim 19). Therefore, Applicant asserts that claims 18 and 19 are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing amendments and/or remarks, favorable reconsideration of the application and issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

If there are any issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through either a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the number below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 14-1437 for any additional fees deemed necessary, referencing Attorney Docket No. 8107.002.US; and Applicant hereby petitions for any needed extension of time not otherwise accounted for with this submission.

Respectfully submitted,  
Novak Druce & Quigg LLP

Date: June 26, 2008

By 

Matthew Smith  
Registration No. 62,545

**Customer No. 69911**  
Novak Druce & Quigg LLP  
1300 I Street, NW  
Suite 1000 West Tower  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 659-0100 (telephone)  
(202) 659-0105 (facsimile)